DOCUMENT RESUME

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ED 054 538 | 24 | EA 003 697 |
| AUTHOR | Urich, Ted | |
| TITLE | The Role of the School Principal in Collective Negotiations. Final Report. | |
| INSTITUTION | Purdue Univ., Lafayette, Ind. | |
| SPONS AGENCY | National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/CE), Washington, D.C. | |
| BUREAU NO | BR-9-E-100 | |
| PUB DATE | Aug 70 | |
| GRANT | OEG-5-9-245100-0060 | |
| NOTE | 57p. | |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 | |
| DESCRIPTORS | Administrative Personnel; Boards of Education; *Collective Negotiation; Educational Research; Elementary School Teachers; *Principals; *Public School Teachers; *Role Perception; Secondary School Teachers; *Superintendents; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Associations | |
| IDENTIFIERS | Indiana; Michigan | |

ABSTRACT

This study measures the amount of agreement among rural, urban, and central city superintendents, principals, and teachers concerning the role of the principal in collective negotiations and the scope and structure of the negotiation process. Analysis of data obtained from Indiana and Michigan respondents revealed that administrators desire to limit teacher organization involvement in the collective negotiation process and see the principal's role as that of board of education representative. Secondary school teachers believe in strong teacher association involvement in collective negotiations and reject the notion that the principal should be spokesman for the teacher organization as well as for the board. Elementary school teachers reject teacher organization militancy, consider the principal to be a member of the teacher organization, and look to him for leadership. Results indicate that principals must formulate a role for themselves at the collective negotiations table or be left out. (Author/JF)

PA 24
BR 9-E-100
EA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED054538

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 9-E-100
Grant No. OEG-5-9-245100-0060

# THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS

August 1970

EA 003 697

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Final Report

Project No. 9-E-100

Grant No. OEG 5-9-245100-0060

# The Role of the School Principal in Collective Negotiations

Ted Urich

Assistant Professor - Department of Education

Purdue Research Foundation - Purdue University

Lafayette, Indiana

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Point of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Acknowledgements | 2 |
| Summary | 3 |
| Type 1 | 3 |
| Type 2 | 4 |
| Type 3 | 5 |
| Type 4 | 5 |
| Purpose of Study | 8 |
| Description of Collective Negotiation | 8 |
| Problem of Study | 14 |
| Procedure | 14 |
| Analysis of Data | 15 |
| Type 1 | 15 |
| Type 2 | 22 |
| Type 3 | 28 |
| Type 4 | 33 |
| Conclusions | 39 |
| References | 41 |
| Appendix | 42 |
| A Items Each Type Accepted or Rejected More Than Other Types | 42 |
| B Consensus Items | 47 |
| C Q-Sort Items Used In This Study | 50 |
| Tables | |
| 1 Indiana and Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 1 | 16 |

Tables (continued)


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | Indiana School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 1 ------ | 17 |
| 3 | Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 1 ---- | 17 |
| 4 | Array of Items Most Accepted By Type 1 ---------- | 18 |
| 5 | Array of Items Most Rejected By Type 1 ---------- | 20 |
| 6 | Items Type 1 Accepted or Rejected More Than The Other Types ---------- | 21 |
| 7 | Indiana and Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 2 ---------- | 23 |
| 8 | Indiana School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 2 ----- | 23 |
| 9 | Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 2 ---- | 24 |
| 10 | Array of Items Most Accepted By Type 2 ---------- | 25 |
| 11 | Array of Items Most Rejected By Type 2 ---------- | 26 |
| 12 | Items Type 2 Accepted or Rejected More Than the Other Types ---------- | 28 |
| 13 | Indiana and Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 3 ---------- | 29 |
| 14 | Indiana School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 3 ----- | 29 |
| 15 | Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 3 ---- | 30 |
| 16 | Array of Items Most Accepted By Type 3 ---------- | 31 |
| 17 | Array of Items Most Rejected By Type 3 ---------- | 32 |
| 18 | Items Type 3 Accepted or Rejected More Than the Other Types ---------- | 33 |
| 19 | Indiana and Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 4 ---------- | 34 |
| 20 | Indiana School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 4 ----- | 34 |
| 21 | Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 4 ---- | 35 |
| 22 | Array of Items Most Accepted By Type 4 ---------- | 36 |
| 23 | Array of Items Most Rejected By Type 4 ---------- | 38 |

Tables (continued)


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 24 | Items Type 4 Accepted or Rejected More Than the Other Types ---------- | 39 |
| 25 | Items Type 1 Accepted More Than Types 2, 3, 4 ----- | 42 |
| 26 | Items Type 1 Rejected More Than Types 2, 3, 4 ----- | 43 |
| 27 | Items Type 2 Accepted More Than Types 3, 4 -------- | 45 |
| 28 | Items Type 3 Accepted More Than Type 4 ---------- | 45 |
| 29 | Items Type 2 Rejected More Than Types 3, 4 -------- | 45 |
| 30 | Items Type 3 Rejected More Than Type 4 ---------- | 46 |

Acknowledgements

My thanks to John McIntosh and Dr. Abdul Khan for their contributions in completing this study.

Thanks also go to Pat Jimerson and Malcolm Hewitt for their efforts in gathering the data for this study.

Grateful recognition is given to all the school personnel who participated in this study.

## Summary

The problem investigated in this study was to measure the amount of agreement between superintendents, principals, and teachers from rural, urban, and central city school districts in Indiana and Michigan concerning the role of the principal in collective negotiation and scope and structure of the negotiation process.

The Q-methodology was the research procedure used in this study. This technique is particularly applicable with the use of a small sample and the study of similarities and differences within and between groups. A sample of sixty items concerning the role of the principal and scope and structure of the negotiation process was selected from the literature. These Q-sort items were administered to two hundred twenty-four educators representating twenty-one school districts in Indiana and twenty-five in Michigan.

Three categories of school districts were selected: central city, urban, and rural. A central city school district was defined as having a population of 50,000 inhabitants or more living within the boundaries of the school district. An urban school district was considered as being on the fringe area of a central city with incorporated places containing 2,500 or more inhabitants. A rural school district was classified as having incorporated places with less than 2,500 inhabitants within the school district.

School districts within Indiana and Michigan were compared because Michigan has a collective negotiation law while Indiana does not.

Data obtained from the application of the Q-sort instrument were factor analyzed. As a result, four distinct factors or types of people were produced. For purposes of classification, they were named Type 1, Type 2, Type 3, and Type 4. A brief summary of the description of each type follows.

Type 1

School personnel most strongly associated with Type 1 were school administrators from Michigan and Indiana. Eighty-nine percent of the Type 1 respondents were either superintendents or building principals of elementary and secondary schools. Only eight females of a total of forty-six who participated in this study loaded on Type 1. In terms of formal education, Type 1 was the best educated when compared to the other types. The largest percentage of school personnel with earned doctorates and credit hours beyond the Master's degree identified with Type 1.

Type 1 views the principal's role in collective negotiations as representing the board of education. This type does not want the principal to act as a leader, spokesman, or consultant for the teachers' organization during the collective negotiations process. To properly

function as a representative of the school board, this type excludes him from the voting unit of teachers and rejects the notion that the local teachers' organization should represent the principal during the negotiation process.

Type 1 does allow the principal to carry on negotiations with the school board about matters that pertain to his own interests and beliefs may they be educational or economic.

Type 1 believes in management by prerogatives by insisting upon ground rules that limit negotiable items to salary and fringe benefits. Similarily, Type 1 does not feel that teachers have the right to negotiate with the school board on all matters that affect the educational program or that teachers should have a sizable voice in making decisions that affect the educational programs. The activities of teachers' organizations are further limited by Type 1 through their disapproval of the strike technique as a legitimate method of achieving the goals of the teachers' organization.

Respondents on Type 1 can be called "educational managers" because of their desire to limit teachers' organization involvement in the collective negotiation process.

Type 2

School personnel most strongly associated with Type 2 were secondary school teachers from Michigan and Indiana who taught in central city and rural school districts. Thirty-seven of a total of 69 or 53.6 percent of the school personnel who loaded on Type 2 were secondary school teachers. Equally apparent was the shortage of elementary teachers who identified with this type. Only seven elementary teachers or 10.1 percent of the Type 2 respondents loaded on this type.

Type 2 not only believes that the concern for quality education should be the major objective of the teachers' organization, but express a willingness to support this belief through involvement in the collective negotiations process. Type 2 respondents gave strong acceptance to the view that a teachers' organization should assist the school board in determining educational policies by being allowed to negotiate with the school board on all matters that affect the educational program of their school districts. To guarantee this partnership, Type 2 believes that their relationship with the school board should be defined in a written agreement upon the completion of the collective negotiations process.

Type 2 accepted more than any other type the right of teachers to strike or to publicly censure a school district in order to achieve their goals.

Similar to Type 1, Type 2 disclaims the notions that building principals should act as leaders, spokesmen, or consultants for the teachers' organization. Type 2 agrees with Type 1 in believing that

principals should be excluded from the voting unit that represents teachers. Unlike Type 1, Type 2 rejects the principal as being a representative of the school board during collective negotiations. It appears that Type 2 places the principal in a neutral zone, being neither the school board's man nor a representative member or consultant for the teachers' organization.

Both Type 1 and Type 2 agree that the principal should be allowed to negotiate with the school board on issues that affect his welfare, conditions of employment and educational matters that relate to his position.

Respondents on Type 2 can be called "anxious participators" because of their desire to become involved in the collective negotiation process.

Type 3

School personnel most strongly associated with Type 3 were elementary school teachers from Michigan and Indiana. As one would suspect, Type 3 contained the largest number of female teachers or 47.5 percent of the Type 3 respondents. Only two secondary teachers from Michigan compared to nine secondary teachers from Indiana loaded with this type. No superintendents and only eleven principals from Michigan and Indiana loaded on Type 3.

Although Type 3 rejects the notion that during collective negotiations teachers should limit their demands to salary and fringe benefits, they emphatically reject the techniques of the strike and sanctions as legitimate tactics of teachers' organizations.

Unlike Types 1 and 2, Type 3 views the principal's role as being a consultant to the teachers' organization and a member of the voting unit that represents teachers. Accordingly, the principal is considered a member of the teachers' organization who assists teachers to formulate plans, policies, and strategies that will be communicated to the school board in terms of issues and demands of the teachers' organization.

Unlike Type 1, but similar to Type 2, Type 3 does not want the principal to act as a representative of the school board. Type 3 agrees with Types 1 and 2 in allowing the principal to carry on negotiations with the school board about matters that relate to his position.

Respondents on Type 3 can be called the "ambivalent participators" because they have allegiance to teachers' organizations, yet are dependent upon administrators for guidance and assistance during collective negotiations.

Type 4

Type 4 contained the smallest number of respondents or 9.4 percent of the total number who participated in this study. More administrators than teachers from Indiana and Michigan loaded on Type 4. Twelve of

a total of twenty-one or 57.1 percent of the Type 4 respondents were administrators. Seven of these administrators were secondary principals from Indiana and Michigan. The smallest group of school personnel who loaded on Type 4 were secondary school teachers. Only three Type 4 respondents held positions in school districts classified as central city.

Unlike each of the other types, Type 4 believes that the principal should be represented by the local teachers' organization during all phases of the collective negotiation process. Type 4 administrators then become aligned and associated with the teachers' organization which automatically separates them from the superintendents and their central office staff which usually represents or gives counsel to the school board. This type probably feels that teachers and administrators have similar concerns and that teachers' organizations can best express their mutual interests. It may also be speculated that Type 4 respondents want to decrease the widening gulf between administrators and teachers.

Similar to Types 2 and 3, Type 4 does not want the principal to act as a representative to the school board during all phases of the collective negotiation process. Type 4 agrees with each of the other types in not wanting the principal to act as a representative for the teachers' organization.

Even though Type 4 believes the principal should be represented by the local teachers' organization, the principal is still allowed to negotiate with the school board about conditions that affect his position. Exactly how this conflict of interests can be overcome was not resolved in the findings of this study.

Although Type 4 believes that teachers should be allowed to influence the school board and have a voice in the decision making process that reflects the educational program, there is little if any support for involvement techniques that would give substance to their desire.

Respondents on Type 4 can be called "educational by-standers" because of their reluctance to become involved with the central office staff and their limited involvement with teachers' organizations.

## Conclusions

It is clearly indicated that the person's position in the school system was the most significant variable in determing the role of the principal in collective negotiations. The state and size of the school districts participants were from had less of an effect on their beliefs.

School administrators and secondary teachers had the greatest differences about the role of the principal and the scope and structure of the collective negotiation process. Secondary teachers expressed a desire for greater involvement while administrators tended to limit the activities of the teachers' organization in collective negotiations. Elementary teachers and some administrators expressed viewpoints

that limited the role of the principal and teachers' organizations in the collective negotiations process.

There are still considerable differences of beliefs among school personnel about the role of the principal in collective negotiations. The role assigned to him by educators of various positions reaches the entire length of the continuum -- from a limited and passive role to one of a consultant to teachers to a representative of the school board. Perhaps the only educators who can clarify and therefore strengthen the principal's role in collective negotiations are the principals themselves.

This study reveals a behavior pattern of teachers that denies the principal from having an important role in collective negotiations while superintendents appear anxious to align the principal on the side of the school board and function as a member of the management team.

No longer can the principal say that he is "just an old fashion school teacher" who turned administrator for the sake of the dollar. Teachers no longer depend upon him for leadership and guidance, and as more men enter the profession this pattern will increase. On the other hand, superintendents and perhaps school boards are looking for assistance and leadership during their relationships with highly militant teacher organizations.

If principals fail to formulate for themselves a vital place at the collective negotiations table, they run the risk of becoming the dinosaurs of education - extinct.

It should be pointed out that all four types showed considerable agreement concerning the role of the principal in collective negotiations and the scope of the collective negotiation process. This suggested that, for Indiana and Michigan at least, there is still a considerable amount of proportional solidarity among education personnel at idealistic levels, and there are no clear-cut findings in research literature to assume that, in general, this solidarity does not characterize the teaching profession nationally.

## Introduction

### Purpose of Study

To measure the level of agreement existing among superintendents, teachers, and principals about the role of the school principal in collective negotiations.

### Description of Collective Negotiations:

Collective Negotiations is a set of procedures usually in written form and officially adopted by the teachers' organization and the school board which provides for an orderly method for reaching agreements about policies of mutual concern and to establish channels for mediation in the event of an impasse.

Collective Negotiations means more than the school board discussing issues with representatives from the teachers' organization. It signifies that the school board is willing to engage in give-and-take sessions with teachers about policies of mutual concern. It is a process where the school board and teacher representatives make proposals and counterproposals in good faith about the conditions of employment and other related matters with the objective of reaching mutually acceptable agreements.[1]

The process of collective negotiations means that teachers as a group will receive consideration and respect in the educational enterprise. Unilateral decisions (usually school board policy) are replaced with a cooperative decision-making process. Each side presents arguments, facts, and reasons in favor of its own proposals. Whatever is mutually agreed upon becomes part of a contract under which the teachers and the administrators operate. When differences of interpretation, or infractions of the agreement occur, grievance machinery provides for adjustments which may affect either or both sides of the dispute.

Since 1960, teachers have been seeking the right to negotiate with school boards regarding salaries, conditions of work, and other related matters. The movement is continually gaining momentum, which is demonstrated by the several hundred collective negotiation agreements that have already been adopted by local school districts.[2] Both the National Education Association and American Federation of Teachers are committed to the philosophy that teachers' organizations should have the right to bargain collectively with school boards. Both

---

[1] Tom Gilroy, Anthony Sinicropi, Franklin Stone, and Theodore Urich, An Educators' Guide to Collective Negotiations (Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill, 1969), p. 58.

[2] Ibid., p. 61

organizations are staffed with highly trained and experienced specialists who are devoted to the objective of achieving the right of teachers to bargain collectively with school boards.

Both organizations have the financial capability to implement and promote this objective, therefore, it is safe to assume that the procedures of collective negotiations will spread to the fifty states and will have a significant impact in shaping the educational scene.

The NEA advocates a series of procedures labeled professional negotiations while its rival organization, the AFT, advocates procedures called collective bargaining. Writers in the field of labor-management relations who do not want to show favor to either organization invented the compromise term collective negotiations to describe both procedures.

The actual differences between professional negotiations and collective bargaining are not completely clear. Many respected authorities have asserted that the differences between the two procedures are insignificant.[3]

The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations:

One of the significant variables in collective negotiations at the local school level is the role played by the school's building principals. Both administrators and teachers lay claim upon their loyalties and, indeed, principals seem to have a foot in each camp.

The National Education Association views the principal as being a member of the local teachers' organization and having some type of representation on their negotiating team.[4] The principal exerts a leadership role within the teachers' organization and as a participant in planning for negotiation strategies with the superintendent and school board. In contrast, the American Federation of Teachers views the principal as being an agent of the school board and superintendent, thus representing management. Generally AFT locals prevent principals from joining their teacher organizations.[5]

---

[3] Ibid., p. 59

[4] T. M. Stinnett, Jack Kleinman, and Martha Ware, Professional Negotiations in Public Education, (New York: Macmillan Company, 1966), p. 1.

[5] Robert Doherty and Walter Oberer, Teachers, School Boards, and Collective Bargaining, (Ithaca, New York: Cayuga Press, 1967), p. 26.

The American Association of School Administrators views the principal as being a vital component of the "superintendency team" during collective negotiations, yet supports his membership in the local teachers' organization.[6] Similarly, the National Association of Secondary School Principals views the principal as having an expertise that must be shared with the school board, other administrators, and teachers.[7] His talents are then channeled through the superintendent in preparing the school board for the negotiation process.

It is evident that the four major educational organizations have conflicting expectations of the principal during the collective negotiation process between the school board and teachers' organization. Furthermore, the effects of collective activity by teachers have placed the principal in a difficult position regarding his relationships with teachers and superintendents.

Cronin wrote in the Phi Delta Kappan that the spread of collective negotiations requires school boards and superintendents to reappraise the nature of their relationships with principals.[8] He discussed the viewpoint that principals themselves appear confused and concerned about their role in collective negotiations. He suggested that principals have been excluded from the collective negotiation process because they have neither been invited nor have they volunteered for service on the school board's bargaining team and they have not insisted on their prerogative to assist school boards prepare for negotiations.[9]

Wildman stated that unless the principal has a voice in the drafting and actual bargaining of the collective negotiation agreement at the central office level, resentment and dissatisfaction on the part of teachers will likely follow.[10] In this kind of organization structure, the teachers may perceive the principal as being in a position to provide only tentative decisions pending approval of administrative hierarchy. Where this situation exists, teachers may find it more fruitful either to by-pass the principal completely or out of some personal consideration for their principal, engage him in a form of low level interaction.[11]

---

[6] Myron Lieberman and Michael Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers, (New York: Rand McNally Company, 1966), p. 374.

[7] Benjamin Epstein, The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations Between Teachers and School Boards, (Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1965), p. 71.

[8] Joseph Cronin, "School Boards and Principals - Before and After Negotiations," Phi Delta Kappan, 49: 123, November, 1967.

[9] Ibid., p. 125.

[10] Wesley Wildman, "What Prompts Greater Teacher Militancy," The American School Board Journal, 154: 32, March, 1967.

[11] Ibid., p. 126.

Lutz, Kleinman, and Evans demonstrated that grievance procedures in the negotiation process have made the principal's position even more untenable.[12] It is often assumed that teacher grievances stem from teacher-principal relationships occurring at the building level, yet the real source of irritation may come from the central administration or school board where school policy originates. In effect, the principal is caught in the middle, having to handle "the hot potatoes" that some one else has cooked up. To rectify this dilemma, the authors recommended the building principal be given a place in the organizational structure that allows his duties and responsibilities to affect the decision-making process at the school district level.[13]

Rhodes and Long[14] explained how the collective negotiation process has affected the principals' membership in the local teachers' organization. In a dispute between the teachers and school board, if principals support the administration, they are in an untenable organization position; if they support the organization, they are repudiating the position of the school board and superintendent. Another complicating factor regarding the membership status of principals in teacher organizations is that several states have regulations stating that their members must be members of the local organization in order to qualify for state membership. Since principal membership in local associations representing classroom teachers may be incompatible with their administrative hierarchy positions, the principals may be forced to organize their own organization at the state level.

Legal developments in Michigan indicate that a major readjustment of principal-teacher relationships is needed. The Michigan State Supreme Court has ruled that executives and supervisory positions (central office personnel and principals) must be excluded from the contract provisions made between teachers' organizations and school boards.[15] It is now quite clear that principals in Michigan will not be given the legal rights and job security benefits accorded to teachers and still be allowed to exercise prerogatives usually reserved for management representatives. Furthermore, interpretations of Michigan Labor Law by the Michigan Mediation Board revealed that principals cannot be active leaders in local teachers' organizations or serve as negotiators for teachers' organizations.[16] Principals who do act in this capacity run the risk of having their school board charged with unfair labor practices.

---

[12] Frank Lutz, Lou Kleinman, and Sy Evans, Grievances and Their Resolutions, (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Press, 1967), p. 84.

[13] Ibid., p. 88.

[14] Eric Rhodes and Richard Long, The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations, (Washington, D. C.: Educational Service Bureau, 1967) p. 16.

[15] John Langer, "The Emerging Elementary Principalship in Michigan," Phi Delta Kappan, 48: 160, December, 1966.

[16] Ibid., p. 161.

The 1969-71 legislative program of the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents supports Michigan's ruling that administrative and supervisory personnel should be excluded from teacher negotiating units during the collective negotiation process.[17] The Superintendents' organization recommended that teacher negotiating units should exclude personnel designated as administrators and supervisors by school boards or by a school district's table of organization. Their guidelines are silent insofar as proposing a role for principals in collective negotiations or establishing a series of legal rights for principals.

In contrast to rulings by the Michigan Courts and the proposed legislative program of the Indiana Superintendents' Association, the Indiana Association of Junior and Senior High School Principals take the position that its members have the right to determine the negotiating unit which will represent them. The following quotation represents two tenable situations suggested for their members.

> 1. The principals in a local school corporation may wish to become a part of the local classroom teachers association. If the local classroom teachers association accepts them, they will be represented as a part of this unit.
>
> 2. The local principals may elect to form a local negotiating unit of their own for the purpose of negotiating their conditions of work and salaries.[18]

Another significant difference between Michigan and Indiana principals centers around the role alloted to the principal during collective negotiations. In Michigan, most legal rulings have placed the principal on the side of the school board and superintendent. In Indiana, the Indiana Association of Junior and Senior High School Principals offered their principals two options in dealing with their role during collective negotiations.

> A. The local principals association may take the position that it serves on the school board's negotiating team.
>
> B. The local principals association may take the position of a consultant to the parties during negotiations.[19]

---

[17] Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, "Legislative Program," Indianapolis, p. 2., (mimeographed), 1968.

[18] Indiana Association of Junior and Senior High School Principals, "The Principal's Role in Professional Negotiations," Prepared by an Ad Hoc Committee of the IAJSHSP, (mimeographed), 1968.

[19] Ibid., p. 5

Regardless of the position taken by principals, states this principals' organization, its members must have the opportunity to react to any negotiable item that will affect the education of children or the use of the physical facility.[20]

Where does this leave the building principal? It is generally recognized that the superintendent's role in collective negotiations is closely aligned with the school board.[21] Assistant superintendents, business managers, and other central office personnel usually pursue a role that is supportive of the school board and superintendent. The principal is the one who faces a series of dilemmas. Although he is considered a line officer responsible for executing the policies established by the school board and promulgated by central office personnel, the agreements arrived at through collective negotiations have tended to erode the principal's prerogatives, his managerial authority and professional status.[22] The principal before the advent of collective negotiation agreements between teachers' organizations and school boards depended to a large degree upon voluntary efforts by teachers to carry out important and time consuming non-teaching functions of the school - committee meetings, PTA attendance, hall and lunch duty, curriculum duties - are now being limited and defined by provisions in the contract. Yet, the principal is still responsible for evoking enthusiasm for teaching and for maintaining a balanced educational program.[23]

The problem of identifying the role of the principal in collective negotiations is complicated by the size variable of the school district. Experience in the past has demonstrated that a relationship exists between the size of a school district and the behavior patterns of school officials. Urich demonstrated that school personnel from rural school districts had important differences in attitude concerning the collective negotiation process when compared to school personnel from urban school districts.[24] School personnel from urban school districts were more willing to take a stand on the scope and structure of collective negotiations while school personnel from rural school districts opposed the establishment of formalizing procedures that structured their relationships between teachers and administrators.[25]

---

[20] Ibid., p. 5

[21] Tom Gilroy, Anthony Sinicropi, Franklin Stone, Theodore Urich, op. cit., p. 87.

[22] John Langer, op. cit., p. 162.

[23] Ibid., p. 162.

[24] Ted Urich, "A Q-Sort Analysis of the Superintendent's Role in Collective Negotiations as Perceived by School Personnel," Prepared for the Iowa Center for Research in School Administration, Research Digest No. 31, University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1968.

[25] Ibid., p. 6.

## Problem of Study

In viewing these situations, it seemed appropriate to find out how teachers, superintendents, and principals perceive the more crucial issues related to the collective negotiation process. This study was designed to measure the agreement concerning the role of principals in collective negotiations existing among superintendents, teachers, and principals. Furthermore, the problem was complicated by urban, rural, and central city school district factions. Finally, there was the further factor that some states have collective negotiations legislation.

This study will seek to determine whether there are differences in perceptions and attitudes concerning the role of the principal in collective negotiations associated with:

A. teachers, superintendents and principals

B. rural, urban and central city school districts

C. existence of state-wide collective negotiation statutes

## Procedure

The primary data for this study was collected by the means of a Q-sort. Q-methodology is a technique for probing for multiple attitudes and perceptions of groups of people. Q-methodology is especially useful for making comparisons of relationships within and between groups of people and it sheds light on what aspects of the attitude have changed and the possible interactions of attitude changes within and between the general subjects.

Statements from education textbooks, journals and policy guidelines of the major educational organizations describing the scope and structure of the collective negotiation process and the various roles of the principal in collective negotiations were collected. Approximately sixty items were developed. These statements represent the Q-sort deck utilized in this study.

Three categories of school districts based upon population density were developed: central city school district, urban school district, and rural school district. A central city school district was defined as having a population of 50,000 inhabitants or more living within the boundaries of the school district. An urban school district was considered as being on the fringe area of a central city with incorporated places containing 2,500 or more inhabitants. A rural school district was classified as having incorporated places with less than 2,500 inhabitants residing within the school district.

The sample population was taken from two states, Michigan and Indiana. Michigan has passed a collective negotiation statute while Indiana does not have one. Census reports furnished information about

the size of communities and directories published by the state departments of public instruction supplied the names and addresses of the school districts and their superintendents.

## Analysis of Data

The analysis of the items in the Q-deck led to four types of school personnel which were identified as Type 1, Type 2, Type 3, and Type 4.

To describe each type the following steps will be followed. First, each type will be described in relation to the school personnel who most strongly associated with each type. Second, the items most accepted and most rejected by each type will be presented. Third, the item selections and rejections unique to each type will be discussed. For this analysis, an average of each items z-score on the other three types will be compared with the z-scores for the type under discussion; items on which there is a z-score difference greater than 1.0 or less than -1.0 will be reported. Fourth, each type will be compared with each other type (See Appendix A). Fifth, a list of the consensus items or items that displayed an absolute difference of less than one standard deviation between z-scores on all types. Consensus items represent statements accepted or rejected to about the same extent by all types (See Appendix B).

### Type 1 Respondents

School personnel most strongly associated with Type 1 are school administrators from Indiana and Michigan. Tables 1, 2, and 3 illustrate the type of person who loaded on Type 1 by job position, state and category of school district. Eighty-four of a total of ninety-four Type 1 respondents or 89 percent were either superintendents or principals. Of a total of forty-five superintendents who participated in this study, only ten did not identify with Type 1. The number of elementary and secondary principals who loaded with this type again illustrate the heavy loading of administrative personnel. Twenty-two of a total of thirty-nine elementary principals who participated in this study or 56 percent loaded on Type 1 while twenty-seven of a total of forty-eight secondary principals or 56 percent loaded with this type.

It is interesting to note that only eight females of a total of forty-six loaded on Type 1. Since most administrative positions are held by men, this supports the heavy loading of males on this type.

In terms of formal education, Type 1 is the best educated in terms of earned degrees when compared to the other types. Twelve of a total of seventeen doctorates identified with this type while the largest percentage of school personnel who earned college credit beyond the Master's degree loaded with this type.

Only one teacher from Indiana loaded on Type 1 compared to nine

teachers from Michigan. The data shows that four of these teachers taught in urban schools, four in central cities, and one in a rural school district.

Table 1

Indiana and Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 1

| District | Total Sample | Percent of Total Sample | Number on Type 1 | Percent of Type 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central | 76 | 33.9 | 30 | 31.9 |
| Urban | 69 | 30.8 | 35 | 37.2 |
| Rural | 79 | 35.3 | 29 | 30.9 |
| State | | | | |
| Michigan | 120 | 53.6 | 55 | 58.5 |
| Indiana | 104 | 46.4 | 39 | 41.5 |
| Position | | | | |
| Superintendent | 45 | 20.1 | 35 | 37.2 |
| Elementary Principal | 39 | 17.4 | 22 | 23.4 |
| Secondary Principal | 48 | 21.4 | 27 | 28.7 |
| Elementary Teacher | 33 | 14.7 | 3 | 3.2 |
| Secondary Teacher | 59 | 26.3 | 7 | 7.4 |
| N = | 224 | | 94 | |

Table 2

Indiana School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 1

| Position | Type of School District | Number on Type 1 | Total Number Each Group | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Superintendent | Central | 5 | 7 | 71 |
| | Urban | 6 | 7 | 86 |
| | Rural | 5 | 7 | 71 |
| Elementary Principal | Central | 4 | 7 | 57 |
| | Urban | 3 | 6 | 50 |
| | Rural | 2 | 6 | 33 |
| Secondary Principal | Central | 4 | 7 | 57 |
| | Urban | 4 | 8 | 50 |
| | Rural | 5 | 7 | 71 |
| Elementary Teacher | Central | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | Urban | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| | Rural | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Secondary Teacher | Central | 1 | 11 | 9 |
| | Urban | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | Rural | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| N = | | 39 | 104 | |

Table 3

Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 1

| Position | Type of School District | Number on Type 1 | Total Number Each Group | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Superintendent | Central | 6 | 8 | 75 |
| | Urban | 6 | 7 | 86 |
| | Rural | 7 | 9 | 78 |
| Elementary Principal | Central | 3 | 5 | 60 |
| | Urban | 6 | 8 | 75 |
| | Rural | 4 | 7 | 57 |
| Secondary Principal | Central | 6 | 11 | 54 |
| | Urban | 3 | 4 | 75 |
| | Rural | 5 | 11 | 46 |
| Elementary Teacher | Central | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | Urban | 2 | 6 | 33 |
| | Rural | 1 | 5 | 20 |
| Secondary Teacher | Central | 4 | 13 | 30 |
| | Urban | 2 | 6 | 33 |
| | Rural | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| N = | | 55 | 120 | |

Type 1: Items Most Highly Accepted

Table 4 reveals the items which ranked higher than one standard deviation above the mean, signifying the array of items most accepted by Type 1. Type 1 desires a principal who has an understanding of the role relationship that exists between the school board, teachers, and administration. They also insist that the principal have an understanding of the principles of "democratic administration" in order to maintain an atmosphere conducive to learning and teaching. Type 1 realizes that a principal's ability to achieve the educational goals of the school district greatly depends upon the existance of cooperative relationships with school board members. A high value is also placed on the principal's ability to utilize his staff in order to achieve maximum results based upon his ability to select the best person for a specific task.

Type 1 prefers a principal who is knowledgeable in the areas of public relations, the psychological makeup of children, and understands learning theories as they relate to curriculum.

Type 1 strongly prefers a collective negotiation process that excludes principals from being included in the voting unit that represents teachers. In contrast, Type 1 strongly views the principal as a representative of the board of education during all phases of the collective negotiation process. In relation to Type 1's managerial stance, Type 1 limits the teachers' organizations negotiating role to topics relating to salary and fringe benefits.

Table 4

Array of Items Most Accepted By Type 1

| Item No. | Item | z-Score |
|---|---|---|
| 31 | The principal should have a good understanding of his role, the board of education's role, and the role of his professional staff. | 1.89 |
| 22 | The principal should know how to utilize staff members and to secure the best possible teaching staff. | 1.85 |
| 7 | The principal should have a working knowledge of the various theories of learning and understand their applications as well as their implications in curriculum development and improvement of instruction. | 1.76 |
| 58 | The Principal should be proficient in ascertaining the wants and needs of the community, the teachers, and the children of the school. | 1.73 |

Table 4 (continued)

| Item No. | Item | z-Score |
|---|---|---|
| 8 | The concern for quality education should be the major objective of the teachers' organization | 1.69 |
| 4 | Principals should have an understanding of the psychological makeup of children and young adults. | 1.58 |
| 49 | Principal should understand and apply the principles of "democratic administration." | 1.57 |
| 46 | Principals should have an understanding of group dynamics, and can effectively orient a group to a particular task. | 1.42 |
| 26 | The principal should recognize the importance in establishing and maintaining a sound public relations program. | 1.23 |
| 20 | Effective administration greatly depends upon a cooperative relationship between the principal and school board. | 1.10 |
| 51 | Principals should be excluded from the voting unit that represent teachers. | 1.01 |

Type 1: Items Most Highly Rejected

Table 5 reveals the items which ranked lower than one standard deviation below the mean, signifying the array of items most rejected by Type 1. In contrast to the one item that related to collective negotiations on the most accepted list for Type 1, all items on the most rejected list pertain directly to the collective negotiation process.

Type 1 strongly rejects the notion that principals should act as the spokesman or leader of the teachers' organization during collective negotiations. Type 1 further rejects the principal in the role of a representative or consultant for the teachers during all phases of the negotiation process with the school board. To emphasize the split between the principal and the teachers' organization, Type 1 rejects the viewpoint that a teachers' organization should represent the principal during the negotiation process. At the same time, Type 1 affirms their involvement in the negotiation process by rejecting the item that expresses the viewpoint that principals should not be allowed to negotiate with the school board or its representatives. Evidently, Type 1 wants the principal to

negotiate with the school board on matters pertaining to their own interests but separate from the issues and demands of the teachers' organization.

Although Type 1 strongly accepted the concept that principals should follow "democratic administration," they sharply limit the teachers' organization role in collective negotiations. Type 1 rejects the use of strikes and sanctions as acceptable methods for resolving disputes between the school board and teachers' organizations. Another limitation placed on the behavior of teachers' organizations concerns the scope of collective negotiations. Type 1 strongly rejects the concept that all items pertaining to the educational program are suitable for negotiations or that teachers should be allowed to negotiate with boards of education concerning policies established by them. In short, Type 1 does not feel that teachers should have a sizable voice in policy decisions that reflect the educational programs of their school system.

Even though Type 1 places restrictions on teacher involvement in collective negotiations, Type 1 believes that theachers have a great deal to say about how their talents are utilized while rejecting the concept that teachers' organizations are needed because principals are usually "unfriendly" to people who criticize their school system.

Table 5

Array of Items Most Rejected By Type 1

| Item No. | Item | z-Score |
|---|---|---|
| 24 | During the negotiation process, the principal should act as a representative for the teachers' organization. | -2.10 |
| 60 | Principals should be represented in collective negotiations with the school board by the local teachers' organization. | -1.72 |
| 50 | The principal should be the one who is primarily responsible for actually expressing the demands of teachers to the school board. | -1.67 |
| 45 | Teacher organizations should have the right to resort to strikes as a method of achieving their goals. | -1.59 |
| 10 | The principal should act as a consultant to the local teachers' negotiating group. | -1.44 |
| 15 | Strong teacher organizations are needed because principals are usually "unfriendly" to people who criticize their school system. | -1.39 |

Table 5 (continued)

| Item No. | Item | z-Score |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | Teachers have little to say about how their talents are utilized. | -1.23 |
| 44 | Principals often dominate the operation of the local teachers' organization. | -1.15 |
| 13 | All matters that relate to the educational program should be considered negotiable by the school board and teachers' organization. | -1.06 |
| 36 | Principals should not be allowed to negotiate with the school board or its representati ves | -1.06 |

Table 6 lends support to the conclusion that Type 1 limits the role of teachers' organizations in collective negotiations. Type 1 more than any other type accepts the viewpoint that negotiable items should be limited to salary and fringe benefits. Furthermore, Type 1 rejects the notion that teachers should have a sizable voice about decisions that affect the educational program. Additional limits are placed on the strike technique as an acceptable method of achieving the goals of teachers.

Type 1 considers the principal as being a member of the management team by giving strong support to his role as a representative of the school board and excluding him from the voting unit that represents teachers.

Table 6

Items Type 1 Accepted or Rejected More Than The Other Types

| Item No. | Item | Type 1 z-Score | Other Types | Diff. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Accepted More Than Others | | | | |
| 34 | During negotiation process principal represents board of education. | .362 | -1.333 | 1.695 |
| 17 | Negotiable items for teachers limited to salary and fringe benefits. | -.217 | -1.708 | 1.491 |
| 51 | Principals excluded from voting unit that represents teachers | 1.010 | - .197 | 1.206 |

Table 6 (continued)

| Item No. | Item | Type 1 z-Score | Other Types | Diff. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rejected More Than Others | | | | |
| 13 | All matters of educational program negotiable by school board and teachers' organization. | -1.064 | .762 | -1.826 |
| 1 | Teachers negotiate with school board about policies established by board. | - .338 | 1.275 | -1.612 |
| 43 | Teachers' organization sizeable voice about decisions that affect educational program. | .062 | 1.331 | -1.269 |
| 45 | Teachers' organizations have right to strike to achieve goals. | -1.593 | - .468 | -1.125 |

Type 2 Respondents

Type 2 contained sixty-nine out of the two hundred twenty-four respondents included in this study. Tables 7, 8, and 9 illustrate the type of person by job position, state, and size of school district. In contrast to Type 1, this type is heavily loaded with secondary school teachers from Michigan and Indiana who taught in central city and rural school districts. Thirty-seven of a total of 69 or 53.6 percent of the school personnel who loaded on Type 2 were secondary school teachers. Further breakdown of the data reveals that twenty-two of a total of thirty-two or 69 percent of the Michigan secondary school teachers identified with this type. Secondary school teachers from Indiana also classified with Type 2. Fifteen of a total of 27 or 56 percent of all the secondary school teachers from Indiana loaded on Type 2.

Equally apparent is the shortage of elementary teachers on Type 2. Only seven elementary teachers or 10.1 percent loaded on Type 2. Similarily, school administrators did not strongly relate to Type 2. Twenty-five of a total of 69 or 36 percent loaded on Type 2.

Table 7

Indiana and Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 2

| District | Total Sample | Percent of Total Sample | Number on Type 2 | Percent of Type 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central | 76 | 33.9 | 32 | 46.4 |
| Urban | 69 | 30.8 | 10 | 14.5 |
| Rural | 79 | 35.3 | 27 | 39.1 |
| State | | | | |
| Michigan | 120 | 53.6 | 39 | 56.5 |
| Indiana | 104 | 46.4 | 30 | 43.5 |
| Position | | | | |
| Superintendent | 45 | 20.1 | 8 | 11.6 |
| Elementary Principal | 39 | 17.4 | 8 | 11.6 |
| Secondary Principal | 48 | 21.4 | 9 | 13.0 |
| Elementary Teacher | 33 | 14.7 | 7 | 10.1 |
| Secondary Teacher | 59 | 26.3 | 37 | 53.6 |
| N = | 224 | | 69 | |

Table 8

Indiana School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 2

| Position | Type of School District | Number on Type 2 | Total Number Each Group | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Superintendent | Central | 2 | 7 | 29 |
| | Urban | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| | Rural | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| Elementary Principal | Central | 3 | 7 | 43 |
| | Urban | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| | Rural | 1 | 6 | 17 |
| Secondary Principal | Central | 2 | 7 | 29 |
| | Urban | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| | Rural | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| Elementary Teacher | Central | 1 | 4 | 25 |
| | Urban | 1 | 6 | 17 |
| | Rural | 2 | 5 | 40 |
| Secondary Teacher | Central | 9 | 11 | 81 |
| | Urban | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| | Rural | 5 | 9 | 56 |
| N = | | 30 | 104 | |

Table 9

Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 2

| Position | Type of School District | Number on Type 2 | Total Number Each Group | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Superintendent | Central | 1 | 8 | 13 |
| | Urban | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| | Rural | 2 | 9 | 22 |
| Elementary Principal | Central | 2 | 5 | 40 |
| | Urban | 1 | 8 | 13 |
| | Rural | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| Secondary Principal | Central | 3 | 11 | 27 |
| | Urban | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | Rural | 3 | 11 | 27 |
| Elementary Teacher | Central | 2 | 7 | 29 |
| | Urban | 1 | 6 | 17 |
| | Rural | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Secondary Teacher | Central | 8 | 13 | 61 |
| | Urban | 3 | 6 | 50 |
| | Rural | 11 | 13 | 85 |
| N = | | 39 | 120 | |

Type 2: Items Most Highly Accepted

Table 10 illustrates the items which ranked higher than one standard deviation above the mean, signifying the array of items most accepted by Type 2. Type 2 not only believes that the concern for quality education should be the major objective of the teachers' organization, but they are willing to support this belief through involvement in the decision making process during collective negotiations. Teachers' organizations, according to Type 2 should assist the school board in determining educational policies by being allowed to negotiate with the school board on matters that affect the educational program of their school district. To guarantee this partnership, Type 2 believes that their relationship with the school board should be defined in a written agreement upon the completion of collective negotiations.

Furthermore, Type 2 is willing to take extreme measures to assure their rightful place at the bargaining table. This group accepts the right of teachers to strike and to place sanctions on school districts as proper methods of securing their goals.

Type 2 views the principal's role as an educational leader by

strongly accepting the item which suggests that principals should have a knowledge of group dynamics and be able to select the best possible teaching staff. In a similar belief, Type 2 feels the principal should have an understanding of the psychological makeup of his students and be proficient in ascertaining the wants of the community, teachers, and children.

Table 10

Array of Items Most Accepted By Type 2

| Item No. | Item | z-Score |
|---|---|---|
| 8 | The concern for quality education should be the major objective of the teachers' organizations. | 1.73 |
| 43 | Teacher organizations should have a sizable voice in policy decisions that affect the educational program of their school system. | 1.65 |
| 1 | Teachers should be allowed to negotiate with boards of education concerning policies established by the board of education. | 1.63 |
| 37 | Complexities of today's world demands that teachers' organizations and school boards define their relationship through written agreements. | 1.57 |
| 22 | The principal should know how to utilize staff members and to secure the best possible teaching staff. | 1.45 |
| 31 | Principals should have a good understanding of his role, the board of education's role, and the role of the professional staff. | 1.38 |
| 4 | Principals should have an understanding of the psychological makeup of children and young adults. | 1.20 |
| 58 | Principals should be proficient in ascertaining the wants and needs of the community, the teachers, and the children of the school. | 1.10 |
| 46 | Principal should have an understanding of group dynamics and can efficiently orient a group to a particular staff. | 1.06 |
| 49 | Principals should understand and apply the principles of "democratic administration." | 1.05 |

Type 2 Items Most Highly Rejected

Table 11 demonstrates the items which ranked lower than one standard deviation below the mean, signifying the array of items most rejected by Type 2.

Similar to Type 1, Type 2 disclaims the notion that principals should act as a spokesman or representative for the teachers' organization during collective negotiations. Likewise, this type rejects the idea that a teachers' organization should represent the principal during negotiations with the school board. Type 2 rejects the view that the principal should function in a dual role by acting as an advisor to the school board as well as a member and leader of the professional staff. Even though the ties connecting the principal to the teachers' organization are broken, Type 2 rejects the item that states a principal should not be allowed to negotiate with the school board concerning issues that affect his welfare, conditions of employment, and educational matters that concern him.

Since Type 2 views involvement in the decision making process as a professional obligation, the idea that negotiable topics should be limited to salary and fringe benefits was strongly rejected. In their desire to extend the right of participation, Type 2 rejects the principal's behavior when he resists the increased use of formal grievance procedures as advocated by teachers' organizations.

Table 11

Array of Items Most Rejected By Type 2

| Item No. | Item | z-Score |
|---|---|---|
| 24 | During the negotiation process, the principal should act as a representative for the teachers' organization. | -2.26 |
| 50 | The principal should be the one who is primarily responsible for actually expressing the demands of teachers to the school board. | -2.16 |
| 17 | Negotiable items for teachers' organizations should be limited to salary and fringe benefits. | -2.00 |
| 60 | Principals should be represented in collective negotiations with the school board by the local teachers' organization. | -1.62 |
| 9 | Principals should resist the increased use of formal grievance procedures advocated by teachers' organizations. | -1.38 |

Table 11 (continued)

| Item No. | Item | z-Score |
|---|---|---|
| 36 | Principals should not be allowed to negotiate with the school board or its representatives. | -1.33 |
| 34 | During the negotiation process, the principal should represent the board of education during all phases of collective negotiation process. | -1.31 |
| 10 | The principal should serve as a consultant to the local teachers' negotiating group. | -1.24 |
| 35 | Teachers do not view themselves as belonging to a profession. | -1.21 |
| 44 | Principals often dominate the operation of the local teachers' organization. | -1.18 |
| 56 | During the negotiation process, the principal should function in a dual role, by acting as an advisor to the school board as well as a member of and leader of the professional staff. | -1.17 |
| 15 | Strong teacher organizations are needed because principals are usually "unfriendly" to people who criticize their school system. | -1.05 |

Table 12 lists the items that Type 2 accepted or rejected more than any other type. Type 2 supports their desire to participate in the decision making process with a willingness to take punitive action agains the school board. Type 2 more than any other type supports the right of teachers to strike or to publicly censure a school district through the technique of a sanction like a national boycott.

Table 12

Items Type 2 Accepted or Rejected More Than the Other Types

| Item No. | Item | Type 2 z-Score | Other Types | Diff. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Accepted More Than Others | | | | |
| 45 | Teachers' organization have right to strike to achieve goals. | .695 | -1.230 | 1.925 |
| 19 | Teachers organization include sanctions like national boycott to achieve goals. | .053 | -1.013 | 1.065 |
| 1 | Teachers negotiate with school board about policies established by board. | 1.627 | .620 | 1.007 |
| Rejected More Than Others | | | | |
| | None | | | |

Type 3 Respondents

Type 3 contained forty of the two hundred twenty-four respondents included in this study. Tables 13, 14, and 15 illustrate the type of person who loaded on Type 3 by job position, state, and size of school district. Type 3 contained the largest number of female teachers when compared to the other three types. Nineteen of the respondents or 47.5 percent were of the female sex. In addition, it appears that 60 percent of the respondents who loaded on Type 3 taught school in Indiana. Eighteen of the respondents or 45 percent of Type 3 were elementary school teachers. Only two secondary teachers from Michigan identified with this type in comparison to nine secondary teachers from Indiana. No superintendents from either state loaded with Type 3. The data also reveals that principals from Indiana more frequently loaded on Type 3 than their similar counterparts from Michigan. However, the tables reveal that only eleven principals from both states loaded on this type.

Further investigating reveals that almost half the female teachers who loaded on Type 3 had less than 10 years experience in education and 25 of a total of 40 or 62 percent were under 41 years of age.

Table 13

Indiana and Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 3

| District | Total Sample | Percent of Total Sample | Number on Type 3 | Percent of Type 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central | 76 | 33.9 | 11 | 27.5 |
| Urban | 69 | 30.8 | 16 | 40.0 |
| Rural | 79 | 35.3 | 13 | 32.5 |
| **State** | | | | |
| Michigan | 120 | 53.6 | 16 | 40.0 |
| Indiana | 104 | 46.4 | 24 | 60.0 |
| **Position** | | | | |
| Superintendent | 45 | 20.1 | 0 | 0 |
| Elementary Principal | 39 | 17.4 | 6 | 15.0 |
| Secondary Principal | 48 | 21.4 | 5 | 12.5 |
| Elementary Teacher | 33 | 14.7 | 18 | 45.0 |
| Secondary Teacher | 59 | 26.3 | 11 | 27.5 |
| N = | 224 | | 40 | |

Table 14

Indiana School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 3

| Position | Type of School District | Number on Type 3 | Total Number Each Group | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Superintendent | Central | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | Urban | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | Rural | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Elementary Principal | Central | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | Urban | 2 | 6 | 33 |
| | Rural | 2 | 6 | 33 |
| Secondary Principal | Central | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| | Urban | 1 | 8 | 13 |
| | Rural | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| Elementary Teacher | Central | 2 | 4 | 50 |
| | Urban | 3 | 6 | 50 |
| | Rural | 3 | 5 | 60 |
| Secondary Teacher | Central | 1 | 11 | 9 |
| | Urban | 5 | 7 | 71 |
| | Rural | 3 | 9 | 33 |
| N = | | 24 | 104 | |

Table 15

Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 3

| Position | Type of School District | Number on Type 3 | Total Number Each Group | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Superintendent | Central | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| | Urban | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | Rural | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Elementary Principal | Central | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Urban | 1 | 8 | 13 |
| | Rural | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| Secondary Principal | Central | 2 | 11 | 18 |
| | Urban | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | Rural | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Elementary Teacher | Central | 5 | 7 | 71 |
| | Urban | 3 | 6 | 50 |
| | Rural | 2 | 5 | 40 |
| Secondary Teacher | Central | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| | Urban | 1 | 6 | 17 |
| | Rural | 1 | 13 | 8 |
| N = | | 16 | 120 | |

Type 3: Items Most Highly Accepted

Table 16 shows the items which ranked higher than one standard deviation above the means, signifying the array of items most accepted by Type 3. This type did not include in their most highly accepted category any items that pertain to the collective negotiation process. Instead, they highly accepted what may be considered "safe" or non-committal items. This conclusion is supported by Type 3's rejection pattern of items that represent involvement by teachers' organizations in the collective negotiation process.

Type 3 strongly accepts the view that quality education should be the major objective of teachers' organizations, but either looks to the administration for leadership or does not believe in the participative procedures so necessary to achieve a quality educational program. This type views the principal as a primary source of leadership by highly accepting the principal as the school's educational spokesman. To achieve this, Type 3 wants a principal who is proficient in ascertaining the needs of the community, the teachers and the children of the school. He should know how to utilize his staff, have a working knowledge of curriculum theory, be able to apply group dynamics, and be able to conduct a sound public relations program.

Table 16

Array of Items Most Accepted By Type 3

| Item No. | Item | z-Score |
|---|---|---|
| 58 | Principals should be proficient in ascertaining the wants and needs of the community, the teachers, and the children of the school. | 2.01 |
| 4 | Principals should have an understanding of the psychological makeup of children and young adults. | 1.93 |
| 8 | The concern for quality education should be the major objective of the teachers' organizations. | 1.81 |
| 31 | Principals should have a good understanding of his role, the board of education's role, and the role of the professional staff. | 1.63 |
| 2 | The principal should know how to utilize staff members and to secure the best possible teaching staff. | 1.60 |
| 7 | Principals should have a working knowledge of the various theories of learning and understand their applications as well as implications in curriculum development and improvement of instruction. | 1.58 |
| 26 | Principals should recognize the importance in establishing and maintaining a sound public relations program. | 1.46 |
| 46 | Principals should have an understanding of group dynamics, and can effectively orient a group to a particular task. | 1.41 |
| 49 | Principals should understand and apply the principles of "democratic administration." | 1.35 |

Type 3: Items Most Highly Rejected

Table 17 illustrates the items which ranked lower than one standard deviation below the means, signifying the array of items most rejected by Type 3. This type strongly rejects the notion that teachers' organizations are necessary because principals are "unfriendly" to people who criticize their school system. Instead, Type 3 views the principal as being a teacher first, then fulfilling his role as a building administrator. Since he is primarily a teacher, Type 3 feels that principals do not dominate the operation of the teachers' organization at the local level. Even so, this type does not want

the principal to act as a representative for the teachers' organization, or for the board of education, but allows him to carry on negotiations with the school board in some capacity outside the teachers' organization. His role as viewed by this type evolves into a consultant to the school board and teachers' organization who attempts to assist both sides to reach a mutually acceptable agreement.

Although Type 3 rejects the principle that during collective negotiations teachers should limit their demands to salary and fringe benefits, they emphatically reject the use of strikes and santions as legitimate techniques in achieving their goals. In short, Type 3 does express a desire to influence the educational program, but shows little initiative to carry out the steps necessary for total involvement in the decision making process.

Table 17

Array of Items Most Rejected By Type 3

| Item No. | Item | z-Score |
|---|---|---|
| 15 | Strong teacher organizations are needed because principals are usually "unfriendly" to people who criticize their school system. | -1.60 |
| 45 | Teacher organizations should have the right to resort to strikes as a method of achieving their goals. | -1.58 |
| 17 | Negotiable items for teacher organizations should be limited to salary and fringe benefits. | -1.54 |
| 6 | Teachers have little to say about how their talents are utilized. | -1.46 |
| 44 | Principals often dominate the operation of the local teachers' organization. | -1.46 |
| 35 | Teachers do not view themselves as belonging to a profession. | -1.43 |
| 19 | Teacher organizations should include sanctions such as a national boycott of a school district as a method of achieving their goals. | -1.31 |
| 36 | Principals should not be allowed to negotiate with the school board or its representatives. | -1.26 |
| 34 | During the negotiation process, the principal should represent the board of education during all phases of collective negotiations. | -1.24 |

Table 17 (continued)

| Item No. | Item | z-Score |
|---|---|---|
| 32 | Principals are not teachers, but managers of people. | -1.21 |
| 24 | During the negotiation process, the principal should act as a representative for the teachers' organization. | -1.10 |

Table 18 lists the items that Type 3 accepted or rejected more than any other type. This group views the principal's role in collective negotiations as being a consultant to the teachers' organization. Furthermore, this group does not believe that the principal should be excluded from the voting unit that represents teachers. According to the views of Type 3, the principal is part of the teachers' negotiating team who assists teachers to formulate plans, policies and strategies that will be communicated to the school board in the form of teacher demands on the school board.

Table 18

Items Type 3 Accepted or Rejected More Than the Other Types

| Item No. | Item | Type 3 z-Scores | Other Types | Diff. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Accepted More Than Others | | | | |
| 10 | Principal acts as consultant to teachers during negotiations | .106 | -.995 | 1.100 |
| Rejected More Than Others | | | | |
| 51 | Principals excluded from voting units that represent teachers | - .814 | .411 | -1.225 |

Type 4 Respondents

Type 4 contained the smallest number of respondents compared to the other types. Tables 19, 20, and 21 illustrate the type of person who loaded on Type 4 by job position, state, and size of school district. Only twenty-one of a total of two hundred twenty-four respondents or 9.4 percent identified with this type. It is interesting to note that only three Type 4 respondents held positions

in schools classified as central city. It appears that more administrators than teachers loaded on Type 4. Twelve of a total of twenty-one or 57.1 percent were administrators. Seven of these administrators were secondary principals from Indiana and Michigan. The smallest group of Type 4 personnel were secondary school teachers, making only 19 percent of the total of Type 4 respondents.

Table 19

Indiana and Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 4

| | Total Sample | Percent of Total Sample | Number on Type 4 | Percent of Type 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| District | | | | |
| Central | 76 | 33.9 | 3 | 14.3 |
| Urban | 69 | 30.8 | 8 | 38.1 |
| Rural | 79 | 35.3 | 10 | 47.6 |
| State | | | | |
| Michigan | 120 | 56.6 | 10 | 47.6 |
| Indiana | 104 | 46.4 | 11 | 52.4 |
| Position | | | | |
| Superintendent | 45 | 20.1 | 2 | 9.5 |
| Elementary Principal | 39 | 17.4 | 3 | 14.3 |
| Secondary Principal | 48 | 21.4 | 7 | 33.7 |
| Elementary Teacher | 59 | 26.3 | 4 | 19.0 |
| N = | 224 | | 21 | |

Table 20

Indiana School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 4

| Position | Type of School District | Number on Type 4 | Total Number Each Group | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Superintendent | Central | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | Urban | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | Rural | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| Elementary Principal | Central | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | Urban | 1 | 6 | 17 |
| | Rural | 1 | 6 | 17 |

Table 20 (continued)

| Position | Type of School District | Number on Type 4 | Total Number Each Group | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Secondary Principal | Central | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | Urban | 3 | 8 | 38 |
| | Rural | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Elementary Teacher | Central | 1 | 4 | 25 |
| | Urban | 2 | 6 | 33 |
| | Rural | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Secondary Teacher | Central | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| | Urban | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| | Rural | 1 | 9 | 11 |
| N = | | 11 | 104 | |

Table 21

Michigan School Personnel Who Loaded on Type 4

| Position | Type of School District | Number on Type 4 | Total Number Each Group | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Superintendent | Central | 1 | 8 | 13 |
| | Urban | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | Rural | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Elementary Principal | Central | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | Urban | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| | Rural | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| Secondary Principal | Central | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| | Urban | 1 | 4 | 25 |
| | Rural | 3 | 11 | 27 |
| Elementary Teacher | Central | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | Urban | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| | Rural | 2 | 5 | 40 |
| Secondary Teacher | Central | 1 | 3 | 33 |
| | Urban | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| | Rural | 1 | 13 | 8 |
| N = | | 10 | 120 | |

Type 4: Items Most Highly Accepted

Table 22 summarizes the items which ranked higher than one standard deviation above the mean, signifying the array of items most accepted by Type 4. This group believes that the major objective of teachers' organizations should be the concern for quality education. To achieve this, Type 4 accepts the notion that teachers should have a sizable voice in determining educational policies and that teachers should be allowed to negotiate about policies established by the school board.

Additional items highly accepted by Type 4 places the principal in the traditional role of educational leader. For example, Type 4 views the principal as someone who has knowledge in curriculum theory, public relations, utilization of staff members, and being able to interpret the needs of the community, teachers, and the children of the school.

Table 22

Array of Items Most Accepted By Type 4

| Item No. | Item | z-score |
|---|---|---|
| 8 | The concern for quality education should be the major objective of the teachers' organizations. | 1.99 |
| 7 | Principals should have a working knowledge of the various theories of learning and understand their applications as well as their implications in curriculum development and improvement of instruction. | 1.94 |
| 58 | Principals should be proficient in ascertaining the wants and needs of the community, the teacher, and the children of the school. | 1.77 |
| 22 | The principal should know how to utilize staff members and to secure the best possible teaching staff. | 1.62 |
| 31 | The principal should have a good understanding of his role, the board of education's role, and the role of his professional staff. | 1.61 |
| 4 | Principals should have an understanding of the psychological makeup of children and young adults. | 1.52 |
| 43 | Teacher organizations should have a sizable voice in policy decisions that reflect the educational program of their school system | |

Table 22 (continued)

| Item No. | Item | z-Score |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Teachers should be allowed to negotiate with their board of education concerning policies established by the board of education. | 1.37 |
| 49 | Principals should understand and apply the principles of "democratic administration." | 1.16 |
| 26 | Principals should recognize the importance in establishing and maintaining a sound public relations program. | 1.11 |

Type 4: Items Most Highly Rejected

Table 23 shows the items which ranked lower than one standard deviation below the means, signifying the array of items most rejected by Type 4. Type 4 does not want the principal to represent or express teacher demands to the school board during the collective negotiation process. At the same time, this group rejects the principal as serving as a representative to the school board, thus placing him in a limited participatary role in the decision making process. However, Type 4 does believe the principal should be able to negotiate with the school board about issues that pertain to his own interests and beliefs. It appears that this group of secondary school principals and teachers who comprise Type 4, want to prevent the building administrators from becoming involved in the collective negotiation process.

Type 4 did express a desire to broaden teacher involvement in negotiations by rejecting the role that limits the scope of negotiations to economic matters as well as the practice of principals resisting the increased use of formal grievance procedures.

Type 4 may be satisfied with the present teacher-administrator relationship because they reject the notion that teachers have little to say about how their talents are utilized or that principals are "unfriendly" to people who criticize their schools.

Table 23

Array of Items Most Rejected By Type 4

| Item No. | Item | z-Score |
|---|---|---|
| 35 | Teachers do not view themselves as belonging to a profession. | -1.93 |
| 17 | Negotiable items for teacher organizations should be limited to salary and fringe benefits. | -1.53 |
| 24 | During the negotiation process, the principal should act as a representative for the teachers' organization. | -1.46 |
| 44 | Principals often dominate the operation of the local teachers' organization. | -1.46 |
| 34 | During the negotiation process principals should represent the board of education during all phases of negotiations. | -1.45 |
| 50 | The principal should be the one who is primarily responsible for actually expressing the demands of teachers to the school board. | -1.38 |
| 15 | Strong teacher organizations are needed because principals are usually "unfriendly" to people who criticize their school system. | -1.33 |
| 9 | Principals should resist the increased use of formal grievance procedures advocated by teachers' organizations. | -1.31 |
| 32 | Principals are not teachers, but managers of people | -1.28 |
| 36 | Principals should not be allowed to negotiate with the school board or its representatives. | -1.27 |
| 6 | Teachers have little to say about how their talents are utilized. | -1.25 |
| 42 | Teacher organizations should have as their primary objective the welfare of the teachers in the school system. | -1.09 |

Table 24 lists the items that Type 4 accepted or rejected more than any other type. This type believes the principal should be represented in collective negotiations with the school board by the local teachers' organization. This type more than any other type was most willing to have the State Department of Education serve as a third party during an impasse period in collective negotiations. In short, Type 4 considers the principal as belonging to the teachers' organization and the collective negotiation process influenced by personnel from the State Department of Education.

Table 24

Items Type 4 Accepted or Rejected More Than the Other Types

| Item No. | Item | Type 4 z-Score | Other Types | Diff. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Accepted More Than Others | | | | |
| 59 | State Department act as third party during impasse | .736 | - .560 | 1.296 |
| 60 | Principals represented by teachers' organization during negotiations with school board. | -.238 | -1.275 | 1.037 |
| Rejected More Than Others | | | | |
| | None | | | |

## Conclusions

It is clearly indicated that the person's position in the school system was the most significant variable in determining the role of the principal in collective negotiations. The state and size of the school districts participants were from had less of an effect on their beliefs.

School administrators and secondary teachers had the greatest differences about the role of the principal and the scope and structure of the collective negotiation process. Secondary teachers expressed a desire for greater involvement while administrators tended to limit the activities of the teachers' organization in collective negotiations. Elementary teachers and some administrators expressed viewpoints that limited the role of the principal and teachers' organizations in the collective negotiations process.

There are still considerable differences of beliefs among school personnel about the role of the principal in collective negotiations. The role assigned to him by educators of various positions reaches

the entire length of the continuum -- from a limited and passive role to one of a consultant to teachers to a representative of the school board. Perhaps the only educators who can clarify and therefore strengthen the principal's role in collective negotiations are the principals themselves.

This study reveals a behavior pattern of teachers that denies the principal from having an important role in collective negotiations while superintendents appear anxious to align the principal on the side of the school board and function as a member of the management team.

No longer can the principal say that he is "just an old fashion school teacher" who turned administrator for the sake of the dollar. Teachers no longer depend upon him for leadership and guidance, and as more men enter the profession this pattern will increase. On the other hand, superintendents and perhaps school boards are looking for assistance and leadership during their relationships with highly militant teacher organizations.

If principals fail to formulate for themselves a vital place at the collective negotiation table, they run the risk of becoming the dinosaurs of education -- extinct.

References

Joseph Cronin, "School Boards and Principals - Before and After Negotiations," Phi Delta Kappan, 49: 123, November, 1967.

Robert Doherty and Walter Oberer, Teachers, School Boards, and Collective Bargaining, (Ithaca, New York: Cayuga Press, 1967), p. 26.

Benjamin Epstein, The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations Between Teachers and School Boards, (Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1965), p. 71.

Tom Gilroy, Anthony Sinicropi, Franklin Stone, and Theodore Urich, An Educators' Guide to Collective Negotiations (Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill, 1969), p. 56.

John Langer, "The Emerging Elementary Principalship in Michigan," Phi Delta Kappan, 48: 160, December, 1966.

Myron Lieberman and Michael Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers, (New York: Rand McNally Company, 1966), p. 374.

Frank Lutz, Lou Kleinman, and Sy Evans, Grievances and Their Resolutions, (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Press, 1967), p. 84.

Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, "Legislative Program," Indianapolis, p. 2., (mimeographed), 1968.

Indiana Association of Junior and Senior High School Principals, "The Principal's Role in Professional Negotiations," Prepared by an Ad Hoc Committee of the IAJSHSP, (mimeographed), 1968.

Eric Rhodes and Richard Long, The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations, (Washington, D. C.: Educational Service Bureau, 1967), p. 16.

T. M. Stinnett, Jack Kleinman, and Martha Ware, Professional Negotiations in Public Education, (New York: Macmillan Company, 1966), p. 1.

Ted Urich, "A Q-Sort Analysis of the Superintendent's Role in Collective Negotiations as Perceived by School Personnel," Prepared for the Iowa Center for Research in School Administration, Research Digest No. 31, University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1968.

Wesley Wildman, "What Prompts Greater Teacher Militancy," The American School Board Journal, 154: 32, March, 1967.

Appendix A

Items Each Type Accepted or Rejected More Than Other Types

Table 25

Items Type 1 Accepted More Than Types 2, 3, 4

Accepted More Than Type 2

| Item | Type 1 Z-Score | Type 2 Z-Score | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|
| 17 Negotiable items for teachers limited to salary and fringe benefits | -2.17 | -1.998 | 1.781 |
| 34 During negotiation process, principal represents board of education | .362 | -1.308 | 1.670 |

Accepted More Than Type 3

| Item | Type 1 Z-Score | Type 3 Z-Score | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|
| 51 Principals excluded from outing unit that represents teachers | 1.010 | -.814 | 1.823 |
| 34 During negotiation process, principal represents board of education | .362 | -1.237 | 1.599 |
| 17 Negotiable items for teachers limited to salary and fringe benefits | -.217 | -1.545 | 1.328 |
| 29 Inclusion of principals in teachers' organization weakens teachers' organization to provide protection for teachers | .064 | -970 | 1.034 |

Accepted More Than Type 4

| Item | Type 1 Z-Score | Type 4 Z-Score | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|
| 34 During negotation process, principal represents board of education | .362 | -1.454 | 1.816 |
| 17 Negotiable items teachers limited to salary and fringe benefits | -.217 | -1.581 | 1.364 |
| 51 Principals excluded from voting unit that represents teachers | 1.010 | -.281 | 1.291 |

Table 25 continued

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 32 Principals are not teachers, but managers of people | -230 | -1.283 | 1.053 |

Table 26

Items Type 1 Rejected More Than Types 2, 3, 4

Rejected More Than Type 2

| Item | Type 1 Z-Score | Type 2 Z-Score | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|
| 45 Teachers' organization have right to strike to achieve goals | -1.593 | .695 | -2.287 |
| 1 Teachers negotiate with school board about policies established by board | -.338 | 1.627 | -1.964 |
| 13 All matters of educational program negotiable by school board and teachers' organizations | -1.064 | .890 | -1.954 |
| 3 Teachers' organizations sizeable voice about decisions that affect educational program | .062 | 1.648 | -1.586 |
| 40 Teacher negotiators allowed time off to negotiate without loss of salary | -.977 | .418 | -1.395 |

Rejected More Than Type 3

| Item | Type 1 Z-Score | Type 3 Z-Score | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13 All matters of educational program negotiable by school board and teachers' organization | -1.064 | .595 | -1.659 |
| 10 Principal act as consultant to teachers during negotiations | -1.442 | .106 | -1.548 |
| 3 During negotiations principal not committed to school board or teachers, function to bring both groups together | -.613 | .798 | -1.411 |
| 60 Principals represented by teachers' organization during negotiations with school board | -1.719 | -481 | -1.238 |

Table 26 continued

| Item | Type 1 Z-Score | Type 3 Z-Score | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Teachers negotiate with school board about policies established by board | -338 | .830 | -1.168 |
| 24 During negotiation process, principal represents teachers' organization | -2.102 | -1.098 | -1.004 |

Rejected More Than Type 4

| Item | Type 1 Z-Score | Type 4 Z-Score | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13 All matters of educational program negotiable by school board and teachers' organization | -1.064 | .801 | -1.865 |
| 1 Teachers negotiate with school board about policies established by board | -.338 | 1.367 | -1.705 |
| 60 Principals represented by teachers' organization during negotiations with school board | -1.719 | -.238 | -1.482 |
| 43 Teachers' organization sizeable voice about decisions that affect educational program | .062 | 1.495 | -1.433 |
| 10 Principals act as consultant to teachers during negotiations | -1.442 | -.298 | -1.144 |
| 45 Teachers' organization have right to | -1.593 | -.517 | -1.076 |
| 59 State Dept. act as third party during impasse | -.295 | .736 | -1.031 |
| 3 During negotiations, principal not committed to school board or teachers, function to bring both groups together | -.613 | .415 | -1.028 |

Table 27

Items Type 2 Accepted More Than Types 3, 4

Accepted More Than Type 3

| Item | Type 2 Z-Score | Type 3 Z-Score | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|
| 45 Teachers' organization have right to strike to achieve goals | .695 | -1.581 | 2.275 |
| 19 Teachers' organization include functions like national boycott to achieve goals | .053 | -1.313 | 1.366 |
| 51 Principals excluded from voting unit that represents teachers | .505 | -.814 | 1.319 |

Accepted More Than Type 4

| Item | Type 2 Z-Score | Type 4 Z-Score | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|
| 45 Teachers' organization have right to strike to achieve goals | .695 | -.517 | 1.211 |
| 42 Teachers' organization primary objective welfare of teachers in school system | -.037 | -1.094 | 1.057 |

Table 28

Items Type 3 Accepted More Than Type 4

| Item |
|---|
| None |

Table 29

Items Type 2 Rejected More Than Types 3, 4

Rejected More Than Type 3

| Item | Type 2 Z-Score | Type 3 Z-Score | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10 Principal act as a consultant to teachers during negotiations | -1.244 | .106 | -1.349 |
| 50 Principal primarily responsible for expressing demands of teachers to school board | -2.157 | -.979 | -1.178 |

Table 29 continued

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 24 During negotiation process principal represents teachers' organization | -2.260 | -1.098 | -1.162 |
| 60 Principals represented by teachers' organization during negotiations with school board | -1.624 | -.481 | -1.143 |
| 48 Principals function as channel and interpreter to both groups during negotiations | -.097 | .964 | -1.061 |
| 56 Principal functions in dual role as advisor to school board and as member and leader of proportional staff | -1.168 | -.123 | -1.045 |

Rejected More Than Type 4

| Item | Type 3 Z-Score | Type 4 Z-Score | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|
| 59 State Dept. Act as third party during impasse | -.962 | .736 | -1.698 |
| 60 Principals represented by teachers' organization during negotiations with school board | -1.624 | -.238 | -1.384 |

Table 30

Items Type 3 Rejected More Than Type 4

| Item | Type 3 Z-Score | Type 4 Z-Score | Diff |
|---|---|---|---|
| 59 State Dept. act as third party during impasse | -.424 | .736 | -1.160 |
| 45 Teachers' organization have right to strike to achieve goals | -1.581 | -.517 | -1.064 |

Appendix B

Consensus Items

| Item No. | Item |
|---|---|
| .8. | The concern for quality education should be the major objective of the teachers' organization. |
| .58 | Principal should be proficient in ascertaining the wants and needs of the community. The teachers, and the children of the school. |
| 2.2 | The principal should know how to utilize staff members and to secure the best possible teaching staff. |
| 3.1 | Principal should have a good understanding of his role. The board of education's role, and role of his professional staff |
| 7 | Principal should have working knowledge of the various theories of learning and understand their applications as well as implications in curriculum development and improvement of instruction. |
| 4 | Principals should have an understanding of the psychological makeup of children and young adults. |
| 49 | Principal should understand and apply the principles of 'Democratic administration.' |
| 26 | Principal should recognize importance in establishing and maintaining a sound public relations program. |
| 46 | Principal should have understanding of group dynamics, and can effectively orient a group to a particular task. |
| 37 | Complexities of today's world demand that teachers' organization and school boards define their relationship through written agreements. |
| 28 | Principal should have an understanding of school law and court decisions that have affected education. |
| 28 | Effective administration greatly depends upon a cooperative relationship between principal and school board. |
| 52 | Principal should have an understanding of pressure groups and can successfully cope with such groups. |
| 39 | Nature of the relationship between teachers' organization and the school board should be determined at the local level |

| Item No. | Item |
|---|---|
| 27 | Teacher advisory committees facilitate decision making processes |
| 38 | Principal should be proficient in the procuring and distributing of equipment and supplies. |
| 18 | Principals should have acute awareness of what consistutes good maintenance and good housekeeping practices, and can evaluate them. |
| 21 | Teachers' organizations are effective in accomplishing education changes in their school systems. |
| 54 | Principals with other administrative personnel should form a negotiating unit separate from teachers. |
| 30 | Principal should be skilled in preparing and implementing budget. |
| 47 | NEA and AFT have more areas of agreement than disagreement. |
| 41 | Principals should not engage in wage or salary negotiations with teachers' organization while a member of the organization. |
| 11 | Teachers should look chiefly to their own organizations to improve their conditions of employment. |
| 2 | State and local sactions of a school district are less destructive to the education of children than are strikes. |
| 55 | Though principal is member of teachers' organization, he should be able to meet separately with the school board to determine his salary |
| 14 | Administrative roles in a school system are a function of the rural-urban setting of the school district. |
| 23 | Teachers' organizations should establish a fund for the purpose of giving financial aid to those teachers who suffer economic hardships due to actions stemming from the collective negotiation process |
| 57 | To insure complete neutrality of a third party, organizations process, outside the education establishment should be called in to help solve a critical issue in the collective negotiations. |
| 5 | During the negotiations process, the principal should refrain from taking part in negotiation, leaving negotiations to the board of education and to the teachers' organization. |

| Item No. | Item |
|---|---|
| 53 | Problems between teachers and principals generally result from organizational rules and regulations. |
| 33 | Process of collective negotiations in local school systems creates an environment which has negative effect on teacher-administrator relationships. |
| 25 | Principal should attempt to prove to school board that teachers' organizations will benefit the teachers in his school district. |
| 12 | Principal should be proficient in developing and/or maintaining a transportation system. |
| 16 | Teachers can effectively formulate and promote policies in disagreement with board if their org. includes administrative personnel. |
| 9 | Principals should resist the increased use of formal grievance procedures advocated by teachers' organizations. |
| 6 | Teachers have little to say about how their talents are utilized. |
| 36 | Principals should not be allowed to negotiate with the school board or its representatives. |
| 44 | Principals often dominate operation of local teachers' org. |
| 15 | Strong teacher organizations are needed because principals are usually 'unfriendly' to people who criticize their school system. |
| 35 | Teachers do not view themselves as belonging to a profession. |

Appendix C

| Item No. | Item |
|---|---|
| 1 | Teachers should be allowed to negotiate with boards of education concerning policies established by the board of education. |
| 2 | State and local sanctions of a school district are less destructive to the education of children than are strikes. |
| 3 | During the process of negotiations the principal should not be committed to the school board or teachers, but function in a manner that will bring both groups together |
| 4 | Principals should have an understanding of the psychological makeup of children and young adults. |
| 5 | During the negotiation process, the principal should refrain from taking part in negotiation. Leaving negotiations to the board of education and to the teachers' organization. |
| 6 | Teachers have little to say about how their talents are utilized |
| 7 | Principal should have working knowledge of the various theories of learning and understand their applications as well as implications in curriculum development and improvement of instruction. |
| 8 | The concern for quality education should be the major objective of the teachers' organizations. |
| 9 | Principals should resist the increased use of formal grievance procedures advocated by teachers' organization. |
| 10 | Principal should act as consultant to teachers' negotiating groups. |
| 11 | Teachers should look chiefly to their own organizations to improve their conditions of employment. |
| 12 | Principal should be proficient in developing and/or maintaining a transportation system. |
| 13 | All matters that relate to the educational program should be considered negotiable by the school board and teachers' organization. |
| 14 | Administrative roles in a school system are a function of the rural-urban setting of the school district. |
| 15 | Strong teacher organizations are needed because principles are usually 'unfriendly' to pelple who criticize their school system. |

| Item No. | Item |
|---|---|
| 16 | Teachers can effectively formulate and promote policies in disagreement with board if their org. includes administrative personnel. |
| 17 | Negotiable items for teachers' organizations should be limited to salary and fringe benefits. |
| 18 | Principals should have acute awareness of what constitutes good maintenance and good housekeeping practices, and can evaluate them. |
| 19 | Teachers' organizations should include sanctions such as a national boycott of district as a method of achieving their goals. |
| 20 | Effective administration greatly depends upon a cooperative relationship between principal and school board. |
| 21 | Teachers' organizations are effective in accomplishing education changes in their school systems. |
| 22 | The principal should know how to utilize staff members and to secure the best possible teaching staff. |
| 23 | Teachers' organizations should establish a fund for the purpose of giving financial aid to those teachers who suffer economic hardships due to actions stemming from the collective negotiation process. |
| 24 | During the negotiation process, the principal should act as a representative for the teachers' organization. |
| 25 | Principal should attempt to prove to school board that teachers' organizations will benefit the teachers in his school district. |
| 26 | Principal should recognize importance in establishing and maintaining a sound public relations program. |
| 27 | Teacher advisory committees facilitate decision making processes. |
| 28 | Principal should have an understanding of school law and court decisions that have affected education. |
| 29 | Inclusion of principals in teachers' organization severely weakens the organization to provide protection for teachers |

| Item No. | Item |
|---|---|
| 30 | Principal should be skilled in preparing and implementing budget |
| 31 | Principal should have a good understanding of his role, the board of educations role, and role of his professional staff |
| 32 | Principals are not teachers, but managers of people. |
| 33 | Process of collective negotiations in local school systems creates an environment which has negative effect on teacher-administrator relationships. |
| 34 | During negotiation process, principal should represent the board of education during all phases. |
| 35 | Teachers do not view themselves as belonging to a profession. |
| 36 | Principals should not be allowed to negotiate with the school board or its representatives. |
| 37 | Complexities of today's world demand that teachers' organization and school boards define their relationship through written agreements. |
| 38 | Principal should be proficient in the procuring and distributing of equipment and supplies. |
| 39 | Nature of the relationship between teachers' organization and the school board should be determined at the local level. |
| 40 | Organizational representatives of teachers should be allowed time off without loss of salary to participate in collective bargaining. |
| 41 | Principals should not engage in wage or salary negotiations with teachers' organization while a member of the organization. |
| 42 | Teachers' organizations should have as their primary objective the welfare of the teachers in the school system |
| 43 | Teachers' organizations should have a sizable voice in policy decisions that affect the educational program of their school system. |
| 44 | Principals often dominate operation of local teachers' org. |
| 45 | Teachers' organizations should have right to resort to strikes as a method of achieving their goals. |

| Item No. | Item |
|---|---|
| 46 | Principal should have understanding of group dynamics, and can effectively orient a group to a particular task. |
| 47 | NEA and AFT have more areas of agreement than disagreement. |
| 48 | Principal should function as a channel and interpreter of teacher concerns to the board of education and the responsibilities and concerns of the board of education to the teachers. |
| 49 | Principal should understand and apply the principles of 'democratic administration.' |
| 50 | Principal should be the one who is primarily responsible for actually expressing the demands of teachers to the school board. |
| 51 | Principals should be excluded from the voting unit that represents teachers. |
| 52 | Principal should have an understanding of pressure groups and can successfully cope with such groups. |
| 53 | Problems between teachers and principals generally result from organizational rules and regulations. |
| 54 | Principals with other administrative personnel should form a negotiating unit separate from teachers. |
| 55 | Though principal is member of teachers' organization, he should be able to meet separately with the school board to determine his salary |
| 56 | During negotiation process, principal should function in a dual role, by acting as advisor to school board as well as a member of and leader of the professional staff |
| 57 | To insure complete neutrality of a third party, organizations outside the education establishment should be called in to help solve a critical issue in the collective negotations. |
| 58 | Principal should be proficient in ascertaining the wants and needs of the community, the teachers, and the children of the school. |
| 59 | State education department personnel should act as a third party when an impasse is reached in collective negotations. |
| 60 | Principals should be represented in collective negotiations with the school board by the local teachers' organization. |